

Remarks:

Prior to entry of the present amendments, claims 1-42 remained pending in the application. The Examiner has, however, indicated restriction of the application to either claims 1-19 and 35-42 (Invention I) or claims 20-34 (Invention II) for examination purposes. If Invention I (claims 1-19 and 35-42) is pursued, the Examiner has further indicated restriction of the application to either claims 1-19 (Invention I-A) or claims 35-42 (Invention I-B). Applicants have herein elected Invention I-A with traverse.

In the October 14, 2005 Office action, the Examiner indicates that Invention I (claims 1-19 and 35-42) and Invention II (claims 20-34) are related as process of making and product made. Applicants have cancelled claims 30-42, thus leaving claims 1-19 (Invention I-A) and claims 20-29 (of Invention II). Claims 20-29 have been withdrawn pending consideration of this Response to Restriction Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Although the indicated product and process are related, the Examiner indicates that restriction is proper because the product of Invention II can be made by a materially different process than that set forth in Invention I. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the product of Invention II could be made "without a plurality of pillars joined unitarily." Applicants respectfully disagree as set forth below.

Referring initially to claims 20 and 21, which the Examiner has classified in non-elected Invention II (claims 20-34), applicants note that claim 20 recites "[a] mandrel for electroformation of an orifice plate produced according to the method of claim 12" and claim 21 recites "[a] mandrel for electroformation of an orifice plate produced according to the method of claim 1". Claims 20 and 21 thus, by definition, must be produced by the method of claims 12 and 1, respectively. Claims 20 and 21 thus are improperly restricted, and should be considered with Invention I (claims 1-19).

Claims 22-29 includes independent claims 22 and 25, both of which expressly recite a mandrel including "a plurality of pillars joined unitarily with the base". The Examiner's characterization of the mandrel of claims 22-29 as being formable by a process that does not include a plurality of pillars joined unitarily this is in error. Claims 22-29 thus also should be considered with Invention I (claims 1-19).

Applicants have elected Invention I-A (claims 1-19), with traverse. Examination of all pending claims (elected claims 1-19 and non-elected claims 20-29) thus is respectfully requested.

////
////
////
////
////
////
////
////


Page 9 - RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT...

Serial No. 10/692,374
HP Docket No. 200206802-1
KH Docket No. HPCS 321

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.



Walter W. Karnstein
Registration No. 35,565
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679
Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner T. Nguyen, Group Art Unit 3729, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on November 14, 2005.



Christie A. Doolittle

Page 10 - RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT...
Serial No. 10/692,374
HP Docket No. 200206802-1
KH Docket No. HPCS 321